

**Accountability System for 2011  
Alternative Education Accountability Procedures  
Commissioner of Education Final Decisions  
April 2011**

These decisions apply to accountability procedures developed for alternative education campuses (AECs) that qualify and are registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. An at-risk registration criterion restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality. AEA procedures also apply to some charter operators.

**Texas Projection Measure (TPM) and Texas Growth Index (TGI)**

The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress indicator has included a growth component across all grades tested since 2005.

1. TGI. For AEA ratings in 2005–2008, the TGI was used in the growth component of the TAKS Progress indicator. TAKS tests meeting the TGI at grades 3-11 were included in the numerator of the TAKS Progress indicator.
2. TPM. For 2009–2010 AEA ratings, TGI and TPM were used in the growth component of the TAKS Progress indicator. TAKS tests meeting the TPM at grades 3-10 were included in the numerator of the TAKS Progress indicator. TAKS tests meeting the TGI at grade 11 were included in the numerator of the TAKS Progress indicator.
3. Use of TPM and TGI in 2011. Use of TGI and TPM will be discontinued in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems. Specifically, the TPM for TAKS and TAKS–Modified will not be available for any state accountability indicators. In addition, the TAKS–Alternate growth measure will not be included in any TAKS indicators in 2011. Similarly, the TPM for both TAKS and TAKS–Modified and the TAKS–Alternate growth measure will not be included in the performance results used in the calculations of 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Rationale: On July 8, 2010, the commissioner sent a letter to all district superintendents that presented several options for use of the TPM in 2011 to ensure student performance is acknowledged and the state accountability system remains transparent. One of the options specified was suspension of the use of the TPM for 2011 state accountability ratings. The commissioner's decision is to discontinue use of the TPM in state and federal accountability for 2011.

The commissioner has determined that the use of the TPM in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems will be discontinued based on the lack of public support for the continued use of the measure as well as the unanimous vote against the use of test score projections during recent floor debate of the Texas House of Representatives on House Bill 500. In 2010, performance on the TAKS tests improved in every subject for every student group and an overwhelming majority of the class of 2011 passed the exit-level assessments for graduation. These test results demonstrate the hard work of students and educators in the state. Unfortunately, this hard work is overshadowed by criticism of the use of the TPM, including an assertion made on the floor of the Texas House of Representatives during debate on House Bill 500 that school ratings in 2010 went up without demonstrations of increases in performance. The commissioner does not want the TPM to continue to detract from the achievements of students and educators.

**TAKS Progress Indicator**

The TAKS Progress indicator is a single performance indicator that sums TAKS results across grades (3-12) and subjects.

1. Methodology. The numerator is the number of TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard **and** TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March or April/May administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of TAKS tests

taken **and** the number of TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March or April/May administrations or in the previous October or July.

2. 2011 Standard. In April 2010, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2011 accountability standard for the TAKS Progress indicator. The 2011 standard was published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule in July 2010. For 2011, the TAKS Progress standard increases to 55%.
3. TAKS (Accommodated). Beginning in 2010, results for all subjects and grades are combined with TAKS results and used for AEA ratings.
4. TAKS–Modified. Results for all subjects and grades are combined with TAKS results and used for AEA ratings in 2011.
5. TAKS–Alternate. Results for all subjects and grades are combined with TAKS results and used for AEA ratings in 2011.
6. TPM and TGI. For 2011 state and federal accountability, TPM and TGI are not used.
7. Required Improvement (RI). In 2011, TAKS Progress RI is calculated for All Students and each student group evaluated and is the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current-year standard in two years. Performance results for 2010 are rebuilt to include TAKS–Modified and TAKS–Alternate results and exclude TPM and TGI. 2011 results using the new race/ethnicity data are compared to 2010 data with student groups defined using the former definitions.
8. Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision. For 2011 accountability, a new Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be employed. This provision applies only to the 2011 TAKS Progress indicator. Under this provision, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select multiple races that include both the Black/African American and White categories will be distributed into either the African American or White groups based on the information submitted on the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents under the former definitions. Only those multiracial students reporting more than one race that includes both Black/African American and White categories will be distributed. If the recalculated African American and White student group performance results in a higher rating, then the higher rating is assigned.

A message will appear on campus and district accountability data tables indicating the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision was used; however, the assessment results will not be changed. The official accountability data for the TAKS Progress indicator will not include the multiracial students. Further details about the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be outlined in the *2011 Accountability Manual*.

In order to monitor possible manipulation of the race/ethnicity data for accountability purposes, TEA plans to conduct analyses to identify districts and campuses with significant discrepancies between the percent of students who are classified as Two or More Races on the spring 2011 assessment documents and the fall 2010 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment files.

Given districts and campuses will have the benefit of rating evaluations calculated under two student group options, state and federal accountability appeals related to the race/ethnicity student groups for the TAKS Progress indicator will not be considered in 2011.

Rationale. As shown in Table 1, increasing the accountability standard to 55% in 2011 maintains the pattern of increasing the standard by five percentage points every two years. Since AEA campuses and charters administer so few TAKS–Alternate tests, combining all AEA TAKS results into a single TAKS Progress indicator is appropriate. Including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS–Modified, and TAKS–Alternate results combines the performance of all special education students in one measure.

Race/ethnicity under the former definition is only available for students that can be matched to the prior year. No prior-year information will be available for some students, such as grade 3 students and students who moved to the state during the 2010-11 school year. However, this provision will only be used to elevate ratings, and the possible benefits outweigh deficiencies. Applying the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision aligns with similar plans for AYP.

<b>Table 1: TAKS Progress Indicator</b>		
<b>TAKS Progress Indicator:</b>	<b>2010 Used</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>
<b>Standard</b>	50%	55%
<b>Definition</b>	TAKS + TPM (grades 3-10) + TGI (grade 11) + Exit-Level Retests	TAKS + Exit-Level Retests
<b>TAKS (Accommodated)</b>	Evaluate all grades and subjects	
<b>TAKS–Modified</b>	Not evaluated	Evaluate all grades and subjects
<b>TAKS–Alternate</b>	Not evaluated	Evaluate all grades and subjects
<b>RI</b>	Calculate and apply	
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	District and Campus Accountability Subsets Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests	
<b>Changes in Indicator</b>	Include all TAKS (Accommodated) results; Vertical scale recalibration	Increase standard; Include TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate results; Discontinue TPM and TGI

#### **Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator**

Beginning with 2007 accountability (2005-06 data), the definition of a dropout changed to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. Under the NCES definition, a dropout is a student who is enrolled in Texas public schools in grades 7-12, does not return to a Texas public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, continue high school outside the Texas public school system, or begin college, or die.

Under AEA procedures, a grade 7-12 annual dropout rate is used. Therefore, registered AECs and charters evaluated under AEA procedures experience the full impact of implementing the NCES dropout definition. As expected, using the NCES dropout definition has resulted in significantly higher annual dropout rates as shown in Table 2. Four years of dropout data (2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) under the NCES definition are available for analysis.

<b>Table 2: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) for AEA Campuses and Charters</b>					
<b>Year of Data</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>African American</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>
<b>2008-09</b>	10.5%	12.7%	11.3%	7.0%	10.6%
<b>2007-08</b>	11.5%	14.4%	12.4%	7.2%	9.2%
<b>2006-07</b>	12.2%	13.3%	13.4%	8.8%	9.5%
<b>2005-06</b>	12.3%	12.1%	14.1%	9.2%	10.0%
<b>2004-05</b>	3.0%	2.9%	3.5%	2.1%	2.7%

Source: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 AEA State Data Tables

1. **2011 Standard.** In April 2010, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2011 accountability standard for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator. The 2011 standard was published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule in July 2010. For 2011 AEA ratings, the Annual Dropout Rate standard is 20.0%.

2. Required Improvement. Annual Dropout Rate RI is calculated in 2011.
3. House Bill (HB) 3 Exclusions to the Dropout and Completion Rates. HB 3 defined certain exclusions that TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings. HB 3 explicitly requires use of the current NCES dropout definition until 2011-12 which TEA interprets to mean 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, 2009-10 dropouts collected in 2010-11 (2011 ratings) will be processed using current definitions without HB 3 exclusions applied.

<b>Table 3: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator</b>			
<b>Annual Dropout Rate Indicator:</b>	<b>2009</b> from 2007-08 Used	<b>2010</b> from 2008-09 Used	<b>2011</b> from 2009-10 Adopted
<b>Standard</b>	20.0%	20.0%	20%
<b>Definition</b>	NCES dropout definition		
<b>RI</b>	Calculate and apply		

Rationale. Using the NCES dropout definition has resulted in significantly higher dropout rates as illustrated in Table 2. A 20.0% standard is appropriate for AEA campuses and charters that are evaluated on grade 7-12 annual dropout rates and required to serve large populations of students at risk of dropping out of school.

#### **Completion Rate II Indicator**

Transitioning to the NCES dropout definition also impacted the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the completion rate denominator changed. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort was affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort were affected, and so on, until 2010 accountability when the completion rate denominator used the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort (see Table 5). As expected, using the NCES dropout definition has significantly lowered completion rates as shown in Table 4. Four years of dropout data (2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) under the NCES definition are available for analysis.

<b>Table 4: Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) for AEA Campuses and Charters</b>					
<b>Class of:</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>African American</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>
<b>2009</b>	74.1%	62.6%	73.5%	83.4%	76.4%
<b>2008</b>	72.2%	60.2%	71.2%	82.4%	69.5%
<b>2007</b>	72.3%	65.9%	70.1%	80.2%	69.2%
<b>2006</b>	77.3%	71.0%	75.1%	84.5%	74.8%
<b>2005</b>	90.7%	89.2%	89.7%	93.5%	90.4%

Source: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 AEA State Data Tables

1. 2011 Standard. In April 2010, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2011 accountability standard for the Completion Rate II indicator. This standard was published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule in July 2010. For 2011 AEA ratings, the Completion Rate II standard is 60.0%.
2. Required Improvement. Completion Rate II RI is applied in 2011.
3. HB 3 Exclusions to the Dropout and Completion Rates. HB 3 defined certain exclusions that TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings. HB 3 explicitly requires use of the current NCES dropout definition until 2011-12 which TEA interprets to mean 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, 2009-10

dropouts collected in 2010-11 (2011 ratings) will be processed using current definitions without HB 3 exclusions applied.

<b>Table 5: Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) Indicator</b>			
<b>Completion Rate II Indicator:</b>	<b>2009</b> Class of 2008 Used	<b>2010</b> Class of 2009 Used	<b>2011</b> Class of 2010 Adopted
<b>Standard</b>	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
<b>Definition</b>	Graduates + GED Recipients + Continuing Students		
<b>Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)</b>	2004-05 – TEA 2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES	2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES 2008-09 – NCES	NCES definition
<b>RI</b>	Calculate and apply		

Rationale. Using the NCES dropout definition has resulted in significantly lower completion rates (see Table 4). Maintaining the 60.0% standard addresses the increased rigor in this indicator caused by the changes in the dropout definition.

### **English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator**

In 2011, AEA campuses and charters will be evaluated on a new ELL Progress indicator. The ELL Progress indicator combines the results from the TAKS English reading/English language arts (ELA) tests and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading tests.

ELL results were reported on the 2008-09 and 2009-10 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports as a preview indicator for the 2011 accountability system. A detailed summary of the ELL Progress indicator can be found in Appendix H of the AEIS Glossary.

#### **1. Methodology.**

All current or monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students in grades 3-11  
who met the TAKS reading standard or met the criteria on the TELPAS reading component

---

All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11  
who took the TAKS reading test or the TELPAS reading component

- 2. Student Groups Evaluated.** The ELL Progress indicator is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.
- 3. Minimum Size Requirements.** The ELL Progress indicator is evaluated for AECs and charters with reading/ELA results for 30 or more current and monitored LEP students (summed across grades).
- 4. Standard.** For 2011 AEA ratings, the ELL Progress standard is 55%.
- 5. Required Improvement.** ELL RI is applied. The RI calculation parallels the calculation used for the TAKS Progress indicator.
- 6. TPM.** The ELL Progress indicator evaluates progress towards English language proficiency and not general academic achievement in reading; therefore, TPM is not used. In addition, the commissioner has decided to discontinue use of TPM in state and federal accountability for 2011.
- 7. AEA ELL Progress Provision.** For 2011 AEA ratings, if the ELL Progress indicator is the only cause for an AEA: *Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the AEA: *Academically Acceptable* label. The AEA ELL Progress Provision applies only to the ELL Progress indicator under AEA procedures in 2011.

Rationale. The accountability standard for the ELL Progress indicator is aligned with the standard applied to the TAKS Progress indicator. In 2011, the first year of implementation for this indicator and the last year of the current accountability system, the ELL Progress indicator cannot be the sole cause of an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating.

### **AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)**

Beginning with the 2008 accountability cycle, GPA indicators were reported for AECs and charter operators rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* to acknowledge high academic achievement. To the extent possible, the AEA GPA system is aligned with the GPA system that acknowledges campuses and districts evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

The AEA GPA indicators in Table 6 will be evaluated at the same standards applied to GPA indicators used for districts and campuses evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

- The two Comparable Improvement indicators evaluated under standard procedures are not evaluated for AEA GPA purposes.
- An Attendance Rate standard of 95.0% is applied to all AEA campuses and charters.
- Only the All Students group is evaluated for AEA GPA purposes. The All Students group is always evaluated; student groups are not evaluated separately.

<b>Table 6: AEA GPA Indicators and Standards</b>			
<b>AEA GPA Indicators</b>		<b>2010 Standard</b>	<b>2011 Standard</b>
1	Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	≥30%	≥30%
2	AP / IB Results	≥15% taking AP/IB test and ≥50% at or above criterion	
3	Attendance Rate	95%	95%
4 - 8	Commended Performance: Reading/ELA Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	≥30%	≥30%
9	RHSP / DAP	≥85%	≥85%
10	SAT / ACT Results	≥70.0% of graduates and ≥40.0% at or above criterion	
11 - 12	Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA Mathematics	≥65%	≥65%
13	College-Ready Graduates	≥35%	≥40%

**Bold** indicates a five percentage point increase from the prior year.